

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claim 16-27 have been amended. New claim 28 has been added. Claims 16-28 are pending and under consideration. Support for the amendments to the claims, as well as for the new claim, may be found in the claims as originally filed, as well as in the specification at, inter alia pages 13, 14, and 25-29, and in Figs. 6, 7, and 12. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Objections to the Specification:

The Specification has been objected to for various informalities. Appropriate corrections were made. Withdrawal of the objection is earnestly solicited.

Objections to the Claims:

Claims 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, and 23 were objected to for various informalities. Claims 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, and 23 were amended in substantial accord with the Examiner's suggestions. The Examiner's suggestions are appreciated. Withdrawal of the objection is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,050,091 to Rubin (hereinafter "Rubin"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended.

Claim 16 recites:

Redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated to said designated modification information on said editor screen.

Rubin neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated to said designated modification information on said editor screen," as recited in claim 16. As Rubin, rather, describes in the Abstract:

Each component in the database is considered a node, and connections among components are considered as arcs. Changes are permitted only to nodes, and constraints are imposed only upon arcs. When components are changed, the effects of the changes are propagated to surrounding components by the arcs. In this manner the database manager insures that the circuit remains properly connected throughout the design process while allowing the propagation of changes up and down the hierarchy.

Since the database manager of Rubin insures that the circuit remains properly connected throughout the design process while allowing the propagation of changes up and down the hierarchy, Rubin has no need for, “redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated to said designated modification information on said editor screen,” as recited in claim 16. Claim 16 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 19:

Claim 19 recites:

Adjusting the magnification of said plurality of placement and wiring graphic information such that the sizes of said placement and wiring graphic information com similar to each other.

Rubin neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “adjusting the magnification of said plurality of placement and wiring graphic information such that the sizes of said placement and wiring graphic information com similar to each other,” as recited in claim 19. Since the database manager of Rubin insures that the circuit remains properly connected throughout the design process while allowing the propagation of changes up and down the hierarchy, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 16, Rubin has no need for, “adjusting the magnification of said plurality of placement and wiring graphic information such that the sizes of said placement and wiring graphic information com similar to each other,” as recited in claim 19. Claim 19 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 17, 18, 20-24, 26, and 27:

Claims 17, 18, 20-24, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,847,968 to Miura et al. (hereinafter “Miura”). The rejection is traversed to the extent it would apply to the claims as amended.

Claim 17 recites:

A user is able to have a choice of displaying only one of the placement and wiring graphic information on said window, or displaying the placement and wiring graphic information sequentially selected and designated on said window.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “a user is able to have a choice of displaying only one of the placement and wiring graphic information on said window, or displaying the placement and wiring graphic information sequentially selected and designated on said window,”

as recited in claim 17. As Miura, rather, describes in the Abstract:

When a component is placed on a circuit board, a placement position is determined by method of elastic center. Then, it is determined whether the component was placed on the circuit board. After that, connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed. After that, the next component is set, and the above mentioned packaging processing is repeated.

Since the components of Miura are placed by the method of elastic center, and connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed, Miura has no need for, "a user is able to have a choice of displaying only one of the placement and wiring graphic information on said window, or displaying the placement and wiring graphic information sequentially selected and designated on said window," as recited in claim 17. Claim 17 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 18:

Claim 18 recites:

When said user selects and designated said processing-related information displayed on said window, said displayed placement and wiring graphic information associated with relevant processing-related information is specified.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "when said user selects and designated said processing-related information displayed on said window, said displayed placement and wiring graphic information associated with relevant processing-related information is specified," as recited in claim 18. Since the components of Miura are placed by the method of elastic center, and connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17, Miura has no need for, "when said user selects and designated said processing-related information displayed on said window, said displayed placement and wiring graphic information associated with relevant processing-related information is specified," as recited in claim 18. Claim 18 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 20:

Claim 20 recites:

Wherein said placement designation information designates placement-pitch or placement-distance of said plurality of placement and wiring graphic information, or reversing operation for each of said plurality of placement and wiring graphic information.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein said placement designation information designates placement-pitch or placement-distance of said plurality of placement and wiring graphic information, or reversing operation for each of said plurality of placement and wiring graphic information,” as recited in claim 20. Since the components of Miura are placed by the method of elastic center, and connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17, Miura has no need for, “wherein said placement designation information designates placement-pitch or placement-distance of said plurality of placement and wiring graphic information, or reversing operation for each of said plurality of placement and wiring graphic information,” as recited in claim 20. Claim 20 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 21:

Claim 21 recites:

Highlighting on said editor screen said placement and wiring graphic information in accordance with placement relationship of said registered catalog placement-related information.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “highlighting on said editor screen said placement and wiring graphic information in accordance with placement relationship of said registered catalog placement-related information,” as recited in claim 21. Since the components of Miura are placed by the method of elastic center, and connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17, Miura has no need for, “highlighting on said editor screen said placement and wiring graphic information in accordance with placement relationship of said registered catalog placement-related information,” as recited in claim 21. Claim 21 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 22:

Claim 22 recites:

Wherein said connecting relationship information includes a wiring configuration for a Steiner tree-like fashion, a wiring configuration for actually wired portions and portions to be wired, a wiring configuration for an arc shape line in a radiating configuration, a wiring configuration for an arc shape line, or, a wiring configuration for a rubber band.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “wherein said connecting relationship

information includes a wiring configuration for a Steiner tree-like fashion, a wiring configuration for actually wired portions and portions to be wired, a wiring configuration for an arc shape line in a radiating configuration, a wiring configuration for an arc shape line, or, a wiring configuration for a rubber band,” as recited in claim 22. Since the components of Miura are placed by the method of elastic center, and connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17, Miura has no need for, “wherein said connecting relationship information includes a wiring configuration for a Steiner tree-like fashion, a wiring configuration for actually wired portions and portions to be wired, a wiring configuration for an arc shape line in a radiating configuration, a wiring configuration for an arc shape line, or, a wiring configuration for a rubber band,” as recited in claim 22. Claim 22 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 23:

Claim 23 recites:

When one of said names of placement and wiring graphic information raised on said list is selected, displaying on said editor screen one of said plurality of pieces of placement and wiring graphic information so selected in accordance with predetermined placing position information which designated relationship between relevant piece of placement and wiring graphic information and other pieces placement and wiring graphic information.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, “when one of said names of placement and wiring graphic information raised on said list is selected, displaying on said editor screen one of said plurality of pieces of placement and wiring graphic information so selected in accordance with predetermined placing position information which designated relationship between relevant piece of placement and wiring graphic information and other pieces placement and wiring graphic information,” as recited in claim 23. Since the components of Miura are placed by the method of elastic center, and connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17, Miura has no need for, “when one of said names of placement and wiring graphic information raised on said list is selected, displaying on said editor screen one of said plurality of pieces of placement and wiring graphic information so selected in accordance with predetermined placing position information which designated relationship between relevant piece of placement and wiring graphic information and other pieces placement and wiring graphic information,” as recited in claim 23. Claim 23 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 24:

Claim 24 recites:

When a moving direction of said displayed placement and wiring graphic information is preliminarily designated on said editor screen, said displayed placement and wiring graphic information is moved under said moving direction on said editor screen.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "when a moving direction of said displayed placement and wiring graphic information is preliminarily designated on said editor screen, said displayed placement and wiring graphic information is moved under said moving direction on said editor screen," as recited in claim 24. Since the components of Miura are placed by the method of elastic center, and connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17, Miura has no need for, "when a moving direction of said displayed placement and wiring graphic information is preliminarily designated on said editor screen, said displayed placement and wiring graphic information is moved under said moving direction on said editor screen," as recited in claim 24. Claim 24 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 26:

Claim 26 recites:

Checking on positional relationships between said displayed respective pieces of said plurality of pieces of placement and wiring graphic information in accordance with said read out placement and wiring rule.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "checking on positional relationships between said displayed respective pieces of said plurality of pieces of placement and wiring graphic information in accordance with said read out placement and wiring rule," as recited in claim 26. Since the components of Miura are placed by the method of elastic center, and connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17, Miura has no need for, "checking on positional relationships between said displayed respective pieces of said plurality of pieces of placement and wiring graphic information in accordance with said read out placement and wiring rule," as recited in claim 26. Claim 26 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 27:

Claim 27 recites:

When a portion of said area within said frame is enlarged and displayed on said editor screen, displaying a painted-out pattern inside said frame.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "when a portion of said area within said frame is enlarged and displayed on said editor screen, displaying a painted-out pattern inside said frame," as recited in claim 27. Since the components of Miura are placed by the method of elastic center, and connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17, Miura has no need for, "when a portion of said area within said frame is enlarged and displayed on said editor screen, displaying a painted-out pattern inside said frame," as recited in claim 27. Claim 27 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27 is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muira in view of PowerPoint® software program by Microsoft®. The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claim 25 recites:

When a copying position is designated on said editor screen, copying said at least partial information of placement and wiring graphic information at said designated copying position under said copy command.

Miura neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "when a copying position is designated on said editor screen, copying said at least partial information of placement and wiring graphic information at said designated copying position under said copy command," as recited in claim 27. Since the components of Miura are placed by the method of elastic center, and connectors are routed between the component and a design candidate component which is already placed, as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 17, Miura has no need for, "when a portion of said area within said frame is enlarged and displayed on said editor screen, displaying a paint-out pattern inside said frame," as recited in claim 25. PowerPoint® does not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Miura with respect to claim 25. Claim 25 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is earnestly solicited.

New Claim 28:

Claim 28 recites:

Redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated with said designated modification information on said editor screen when said modification information displayed on said window is designated.

None of the cited references teach, disclose, or suggests, "redisplaying the placement and wiring graphic information associated with said designated modification information on said editor screen when said modification information displayed on said window is designated," as recited in claim 28. Claim 28 is thus believed to be allowable.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 16-28 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 16-28 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

03/12/06

By


Thomas E. McKiernan

Registration No. 37.889

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501